



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,876	09/14/2000	Joshua Haghpasand		9275

7590 11/01/2007
Steven Horowitz
Counselor at Law
295 Madison Avenue
Suite 700
New York, NY 10017

EXAMINER

SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/01/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

CA

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/661,876

Applicant(s)

HAGHPASSAND, JOSHUA

Examiner

Jeffrey R. Swearingen

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9,10,14-17,20,21,23,24,32-34,51,52,55,56,59-79 and 115-118 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,9,10,14-17,20,21,23,24,32-34,51,52,55,56,59-79 and 115-118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 7,8,11-13,18,19,22,25-30,37-39,41-50,53,54,57,58,80-102 and 119-124.

Art Unit: 2145

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 7-8, 11-13, 18-19, 22, 25-30, 37-39, 41-50, 53-54, 57-58, 80-102, 119-124 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 5/9/2007.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 9-10, 14-17, 20-21, 23-24, 32-334, 51-52, 55-56, 59-79, and 115-118 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 5, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims in question were rejected originally because the computer had no artificial intelligence capability to support a self-configuring account. Applicant amended the specification "to clarify" that the self in self-configuring was a user. This has introduced new matter into the specification, and should be removed.

5. Claims 1, 5, 9, 23, 33, 62-67, and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims in question were rejected because no definition existed in the specification of friendly and

Art Unit: 2145

unfriendly lists. Applicant amended the specification to define friendly and unfriendly lists. This has introduced new matter into the specification, and should be removed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1, 5, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant argues that a "self-configuring" account is configured by the user. Applicant cannot claim human beings as an active part of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 14-17, 20-21, 23-24, 32-34, 51-52, 55-56, 59-79, and 115-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuh (US 6,463,474 B1) in view of Adoba et al. (RFC 2607: Proxy Chaining and Policy Implementation in Roaming, June 1999).

10. In regard to claims 1 and 5, Fuh disclosed:

a plurality of computer users,

one or a plurality of user computers, each having a dynamically allocated Internet protocol address or a static Internet Protocol address,

an administrative module/interface that includes configuration settings for inbound communications and for outbound communications, has list maintenance functions including list editing, list deleting, searching of lists, saving of lists, proxy chaining routing, adding and deleting users, interchanging lists and importing and exporting lists,

Art Unit: 2145

said administrative module located in a user computer for configuring a range of access levels and being capable of creating three types of user accounts that require unique authentication credentials for each user account including an administrator account that is self-configuring, regular accounts with administrative privileges other than the privilege to create additional accounts or view information on any other accounts and regular accounts without administrative privileges,

a first proxy server in one or a plurality of user computers of a local area network with access to the world wide web, each of said first proxy server having a friendly outbound list and/or an unfriendly outbound list only one of which is active at any given time, and/or having a friendly inbound list and/or an unfriendly inbound list only one of which is active at any given time, the friendly outbound list, the unfriendly outbound list, the friendly inbound list and the unfriendly inbound lists being uniquely configurable for each user account,

said first proxy server programmed to receive a request from an HTTP client, check the identity of a requesting client and/or of a requesting URL against the friendly inbound, friendly outbound, unfriendly inbound or unfriendly outbound list maintained by the administrative module and then either approve the request, terminate the request or re-route the request. Fuh disclosed a firewall protecting against unwanted traffic that is inbound or outbound. Column 7, lines 41-47. Fuh performed an authentication procedure to ensure access. Column 7, lines 48-61.

Fuh failed to disclose the use of proxy chaining. Fuh did disclose the use of a single proxy. However, Adoba disclosed the use of proxy chaining in roaming network systems. See Adoba, Introduction, Adoba, Proxy chaining. Adoba was for roaming mobile network systems. Fuh likewise was designed to be flexible enough to allow for mobile systems. Fuh, column 8, lines 49-64 refer to the use of multiple modems or ISDN channels. Fuh, column 17, lines 13-27 disclose the use of communications over wireless links, modems, telephone lines, and ISDN. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use proxy chaining, as illustratively taught by Adoba, with a mobile proxy system such as Fuh, for added security and privacy while surfing the Internet and accessing data.

11. In regard to claims 2 and 6, Fuh in view of Adoba further disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

the second proxy server has all the characteristics of a first proxy server but has an empty unfriendly outbound list. Adoba teaches in section 5 that some of the proxy servers will not have all of the accounting data.

12. In regard to claims 3, 64, 66, and 72, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

a third proxy server and/or additional proxy servers forward inbound requests for resources to proxy servers other than the first and second proxy servers.

Adoba, Proxy Chaining

13. In regard to claims 4, 23, and 33, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

the system is compatible with dialup modem connection to the Internet, the system is compatible with a local area network and the system is compatible with virtual network connection.

Fuh, column 7, line 17

14. In regard to claims 15, 17, 21, 24, 32, and 34, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

the range of access levels ranges from allowing all access to allowing no access at all.

Allowing all traffic through the Access Control list in column 9 of Fuh was allowing all access.

Denying all traffic through an Access Control List in Fuh, column 9 was allowing no access at all.

15. In regard to claims 9-10, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

said administrative module being capable of also creating a fourth type of user account namely one anonymous guest user account to be used by general users without authentication credentials. The different types of accounts are inherent to Cisco routers using the IOS as disclosed in Fuh, column 1, lines 41-57. Cisco IOS supported an administrator account and other user accounts with varying access levels at the time of the invention.

16. In regard to claims 14, and 16, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

a first proxy server is in each and every user computer. Fuh, column 17, lines 42-61.

17. In regard to claims 51-52, 55-56, and 115-118, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

said first proxy server is also programmed to register the request in a logfile of all websites requested by a user. Column 5, lines 39-42.

18. In regard to claims 59 and 68, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

Art Unit: 2145

the first proxy server is programmed to check the identity of a user who logs into the first proxy server and who presents a unique authentication credential prior to checking the identity of the requesting client and/or requested URL against the list or lists.

Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56

19. In regard to claims 60, 69, 75, 78, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

the first proxy server is programmed, upon a successful authentication of the user's credential, to use a configuration of the user's account to check the identity of the requesting client and/or requested URL against the list or lists. Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56

20. In regard to claims 61, 70, 76, 79, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

the first proxy server is programmed that if said first proxy server fails to authenticate the user, then the first proxy server offers that user an opportunity to log in as an anonymous guest user. Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56. The authentication procedure of Fuh inherently allowed a user to attempt to log in again after the first login attempt failed.

21. In regard to claims 62, 65, 67, 73, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

a third proxy server and/or additional proxy servers forward the outbound requests for access to websites to other proxy servers other than the first and second proxy servers. Adoba, Proxy chaining.

22. In regard to claims 63 and 71, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

inbound communications are arranged so that an actual location of an important resource is located in an unpublished location that is a replacement location to which requests rejected by the first proxy server are rerouted, wherein clients of approved users are listed in the first proxy server in the unfriendly inbound list and are sent by the first proxy server to the replacement location, and wherein clients of unapproved users are not listed in the unfriendly inbound list and have their request sent to a published address that contains unimportant information. Fuh, column 9, lines 20-55

23. In regard to claims 74, 77, Fuh in view of Adoba disclosed:

the first proxy server is programmed to check the identity of a user who logs into the first proxy server and who presents a unique authentication credential against a valid user account prior to checking

Art Unit: 2145

the identity of the requesting client and/or requested URL against the list or lists. Fuh, column 12, lines 38-56.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Posey, Brien M. "Creating a Proxy Server Chain." www.techrepublic.com. December 1, 1999.

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2145

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Jason Cardone
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

JRS